

<p><u>MEETING</u></p> <p>WEST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE</p>
<p><u>DATE AND TIME</u></p> <p>THURSDAY 6TH MARCH, 2014</p> <p>AT 7.00 PM</p>
<p><u>VENUE</u></p> <p>HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, NW4 4BG</p>

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
5.1	ADDENDUM TO THE REPORT	1 - 4

Paul Frost 0208 359 2205 paul.frost@barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

WEST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

6 March 2014

AGENDA ITEM 6a

**ADDENDUM TO ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT
MANAGEMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL'S REPORT**

Page 1-19
713 Finchley Road
F/06021/13

Since the committee report was written two further letters of objection were received. No new issues were raised.

Page 63-68
Ground Floor Flat, 6 Manor View
F/00088/14

The following condition should be added:

6. Before the extension hereby permitted is occupied the proposed new ground floor window(s) to the side elevation facing No.4 Manor View shall be glazed with obscure glass only and shall be permanently retained as such thereafter and shall be permanently fixed shut with only a fanlight opening.

Reason:

To safeguard the privacy and amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012).

Para 1 on page 67 should be deleted and replaced with:

The proposed rear extension will extend beyond the existing extension of the adjoining property (No. 8 Manor View) by 2.3m. However, No. 6 benefits from an existing single storey rear extension located on the boundary with No.8 and the proposed extension would only project rearwards a further 0.75m beyond the elevation of the existing rear extension. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not adversely impact on the amenity of the residents of this property.

Para 2 on page 67 should be deleted and replaced with:

The proposed extension would be set 0.95m off the boundary with No.4 Manor View. No.4 differs in design from the application property in that it has a part single, part two storey rear projection and a clear glazed ground floor window in the side elevation facing No. 6. However, this window is a north east facing window and is a secondary kitchen window. The proposed

extension would project a further 1.75m rearwards than the existing rear projection at No. 4. As a result it is not considered given the orientation of the property (No.4 is to the south-east of the application site); the proposed depth of the new extension and the fact that the room affected is a kitchen and benefits from dual aspect windows that whilst the proposal will result in some loss of light to this room it is not considered that this would be sufficient to form a sustainable reason for refusal.

Since the committee report was written a Councillor has forwarded a letter from a neighbour raising the following issues:

- The report incorrectly refers to loss of light to No.8 (the attached property) and not No. 4
- The proposal will result in loss of light and outlook to the kitchen area of No. 4.
- The report states that the extension will be 1m from the boundary wall with No. 4 where in fact it is 0.9m.
- The report states that the extension will not extend beyond the rear wall of No.4. However, it will extend 1.25m beyond the rear wall and therefore affect daylight and outlook.
- The proposal will replace the original coal shed with an extension 4.09m deep when measured from the original rear wall of the house and as result the extension will be overbearing and intrusive in its scale, appearance and impact.
- The proposal is out of character with adjoining properties.
- The property was extended in 2010 and the rear wall of this extension should not be confused with the original rear wall.

Officers response to the points raised:

- The committee report is incorrect in that it refers to No.8 but is in fact considering the impact to No. 4. Whilst the proposed extension would project 2.3m beyond the rear elevation of the existing extension at No.8 this in fact will be an increase of 0.75m beyond the rear elevation of the existing extension at No.6 that is located on the boundary with this property and therefore the additional depth is not considered to adversely impact on the amenity of the residents at No. 8.
- The impact on the window in the side elevation of No.4 is considered in the report (albeit that it incorrectly refers to No.8). In addition as outlined in the report the window in the flank elevation is a secondary window to the kitchen.
- On re-scaling the plans the distance from the side elevation of the proposed extension and the boundary of No.4 scales at 0.95m.
- The committee report is incorrect to state that the proposed extension would not project beyond the rear wall of No.4 (p67). The site has been revisited and the proposed extension measured out on site. The proposed extension would project approx 1.75m beyond the rear wall of the single storey rear projection at No.4. However, it is considered given the orientation of the property (No.4 is to the south-east of the

application site); the fact that the room affected benefits from dual aspect windows and the proposed depth of the new extension that whilst the proposal will result in some loss of light it is not considered that this would be sufficient to form a sustainable reason for refusal.

- The extension will extend 4.6m from the original rear elevation and the issue of the impact of the extension is considered in the committee report.
 - The impact on the character and amenity is considered in the committee report.
 - According to planning records the last application for permission on this property was in 1970. There is no record, or evidence on site of an extension built at No. 6 in 2010.
-

Page 77-84

Middlesex University, NW4 4BT

H/06131/13

Condition 4 to be amended as follows:

The floodlights hereby approved shall only be used between the hours of 08:00 and 22:00 on Mondays to Saturdays and 08:00 to 19:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason:

To safeguard the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties.

Team	Booked Times	Full or half pitch
Monday		
MDX Competitive Football	17:00 – 22:00	Full
Tuesday		
Hendon Inter Schools FC	18:30 – 20:30	Half
Wingate and Finchley Youth FC	19:30 – 21:00	Half
Wednesday		
Hendon Inter Schools FC	18:30 – 20:30	Half
Abdul Rahman	20:30 – 22:00	Half
Ciaran Deely	19:30 – 21:00	Half
Thursday		
Whetstone Wanderers FC	18:00 – 20:00	Half
Hendon Inter Schools FC	19:30 – 20:30	Half
Jay Onabolawe	20:00 – 22:00	Half

Nigel Kyte	20:30 – 22:00	Half
Friday		
PARS FC	19:30 – 21:00	Half
Hylton Frazer	20:00 – 21:00	Half
Saturday		
FA Coaching frequently	09:00 – 17:00	Full
Sunday		
Mohammed	10:00 – 12:00	Half
Hemal Davda	10:00 – 11:00	Half

The attached table shows the typical weekly use between October and April. It is noted that the multi use sports pitch was used more frequently when it was in better condition and some of the more frequent users have moved elsewhere because of the deterioration of the pitch.

Ten additional letters of objection were received. The objections can be summarised as follows:

- Visual impact on the neighbour bright lights
- Impact on neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance
- Middlesex University is changing the character of the area from residential to commercial use
- Floodlights will increase the number of hours that the students are on the periphery of the premises which will mean negative impact students have on local residents will be increased to much later in the day
- Additional light pollution
- Infrastructure not built for such intensive use
- Consultation distance should be extended beyond 50m
- Downward facing lights will still spill onto neighbours property
- No sound barrier

The comments have been addressed in the main body of the report
